

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on March 18, 2007. Claims 1-46 are currently pending in the application, with Claims 1, 24 and 44 being in independent form. It is respectfully submitted that the claims pending in the application, namely Claims 1-46, are fully supported by the specification, introduce no new subject matter, and are patentable over the prior art. Favorable review is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 6, 8 and 24

Claims 1, 6, 8 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bohlen et al (US 3,764,898, hereinafter “Bohlen”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

Bohlen does not describe or suggest the recited “an ionization source positioned above said top surface of said electronic substrate and connected to a first voltage source”, of Claim 1 or the recited “creating a region of ionized particles at an ionization source positioned above said top surface of said electronic substrate by applying a first voltage to said ionization source” of Claim 24. In contrast, Bohlen is directed to a method of testing the electrical continuity of a conductor line using an electron beam. It is respectfully submitted that the electron beam system of Bohlen is fundamentally different from the ionization source described by applicants’ claims. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 24 are believed to be patentable over Bohlen. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 8 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4 and 25-27

Claims 2-4 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohlen in view of Lagowski (US 6,538,462). Claims 2-4 and 25-27 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 24, respectively. Therefore, Claims 2-4 and 25-27 are patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claims 1 and 24. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 2-4 and 25-27 be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 28

Claims 5 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohlen in view of Wakalopoulos (US 3,970,892). Claims 5 and 28 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 24, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claims 1 and 24. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 7-17, 29-38 and 44-46

Claims 7-17, 29-38 and 44-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohlen. Claims 7-17 and 29-38 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 24, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above

for independent Claims 1 and 24. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

With regards to Claims 44-46, it is respectfully submitted that Bohlen teaches away from the recited “creating a region of ionized particles at an ionization source positioned above said top surface of said electronic substrate by applying a first voltage to said ionization source” of independent Claim 44. Bohlen uses an electron beam system, which is costlier and works under high volume. Accordingly, independent Claim 44 is believed to be patentable over Bohlen. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 45 and 46 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 44 and 24, respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claims 44 and 24 hereinabove. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 18-23 and 39-43

Claims 18-23 and 39-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohlen in view of Nishioka et al. (US 6,043,665). Claims 18-23 and 39-43 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 24, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above for independent Claims 1 and 24. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending in this application, namely Claims 1-46 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early and favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

No fee is believed to be due for the submission of this amendment. If any fees are required, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully Submitted,

/ Rosa Suazo Yaghmour /
Rosa Suazo Yaghmour
Reg. No. 56,753
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: (845) 892-9701

International Business Machines Corporation
D/18G, B/321, Zip 482
2070 Route 52
Hopewell Junction, NY 12533
Phone: (845) 892-9701
Fax: (845) 892-6363